



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

verb-forms that is as fixed and often as mechanical as its time-system is defective. The phenomena of sequence (which it is not our purpose here to discuss) grow out of the signification of the perfect and imperfect, and thus, if the above view be correct, out of the distinct consciousness that the Hebrew retained of the nominal origin of its verb.

III.—On a Certain Apparently Pleonastic Use of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$.

BY FREDERIC D. ALLEN,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

In many expressions $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ seems to be used superfluously, but this is notably so in $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἄλλως and $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἐτέρως, ‘otherwise.’ Grammarians explain the origin of these phrases as best they can, generally regarding them as abbreviations of longer phrases containing a comparison. So Kühner (*Ausführliche Grammatik*, vol. ii., p. 921) says that $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἄλλως stands for οὕτως $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἄλλο ἐστίν, ‘thus as something else is’; and similarly $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἐτέρως. Krüger speaks to much the same effect, and so does Klotz in his *Devarius*. Liddell and Scott consider the $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ as used to “strengthen” the positive; others have thought of the exclamatory $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ in this connection (‘oh, how differently!’). In short, the whole matter is highly nebulous. Yet it is not hard to see what was probably the origin of these expressions, if only one is willing to look a little below the surface of things.

The adverbs in -ως are, as I suppose every one now knows, the old ablative singular. This case ended in Sanskrit in -at or -āt, in old Latin in *ēd* or *ōd* (feminine *ād*), and in pre-Hellenic Greek in -ωτ. This final *t*-sound, as it could not maintain itself in Greek, was either dropped (as in οὕτω, ᾧ-δε), or changed to σ (as in οὕτως, σοφῶς, δικαίως). Now these phrases $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἄλλως, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἐτέρως, are, as I take it, nothing more or less than the ablatives of ὁ ἄλλος, ὁ ἕτερος, petrified—if one may so express

it—into adverbs. This *ώς* is not the ordinary *ώς*, adverb of the relative *ὅς*, but is here the adverb of the article *ὁ*, and the two adverbial ablatives *ώς* and *ἄλλως* agree together just as the genitives *τοῦ ἄλλου*, or the accusatives *τὸν ἄλλον*. *Ὡς ἑτέρως* meant originally ‘in the other manner,’ and so find a simple and rational explanation. For example, DEM. Cor. § 85; *ἐάν τε καλῶς ἔχῃ, χάριτος τυγχάνει, ἐάν τε ὡς ἐτέρως, τιμωρίας*, “If matters are in a good condition they meet with approval, if *in the opposite condition*, punishment.”

Just the same use of *ώς* lies even more clearly before us in *ώς αὐτως* (written *ὡσαύτως* or separately *ώς δ’ αὐτως*). This is the ablative of *ὁ αὐτός*, and means ‘in the same manner,’ ‘just so.’ The recognition of this simple fact ought to give the form *αὐτως* its final quietus. This spelling was defended by Elmsley and others on the ground that the adverb came from *οὗτος*, or rather from the feminine *αὕτη*; and it still finds some adherents, even among such men as August Nauck. Supposing the adverb to come from *οὗτος*, then what can *ώς αὐτως* mean? Just as little as *ώς οὕτως*, and that would be as bad as *ὁ οὗτος*.* But even aside from this, the idea of an *αὐτως* from *οὗτος* is untenable. In the first place, *οὗτος* has already its properly formed adverb in *οὕτως*, and a separate adverb in *-ως* formed from the feminine would be a thing unheard of. Secondly, the forms of *οὗτος* all require their first syllable to conform to the last in color, and an *αὐτως* (even if formed from the feminine) would be as impossible as a genitive plural *ταύτων*. The right derivation is certainly from *αὐτός*, and the right spelling *αὐτως*. The accent is thrown back; this is an irregularity, of course,

* Professor T. D. Seymour, since this paper was presented, has kindly called my attention to the following paragraph of Buttman’s Lexil. vol. i., 13, 7: “Nach dieser Schreibart [*ώς δ’ αὐτως*] wäre also diese Form eine Häufung der Demonstrativa *ώς* und *αὐτως*, welches kaum denkbar ist, so wenig als im adjectiven Sinn *ὁ οὗτος* oder *ὅς οὗτος* jemals den Begriff *derselbe* hatte. Aber eben aus dieser Erwägung ergibt sich von selbst, dass da im adjectiven Sinn gesagt wird *ὁ αὐτός*, das natürliche Adverb davon *ὡς αὐτῶς* sein müsste. Ich glaube es bedarf nur dieser Darlegung um gewiss zu machen dass dies der wahre Ursprung jener zusammengesetzten Partikel ist, da denn die übliche Betonung und Behauchung in *ὡσαύτως*, *ώς δ’ αὐτως* durch eine Verwirrung in die Form *αὐτως* entstanden sein muss.” I had entirely overlooked this passage, and did not remember that any one had ever suggested the (to me very obvious) connection between *ὁ αὐτός* and *ὡσαύτως*.

but not an unparalleled one. Bekker, it may be observed in passing, writes αἰτῶς in Homer, in the phrase ὥς δ' αἰτῶς, on his own authority.

It seems then clear that in these three formulae, ὥς αἰτῶς, ὥς ἄλλως, ὥς ἐτέρως, ὥς is the ablative of the article ὁ, and so differs in origin from the ordinary ὥς from εἶς. Whether this could be carried still further, namely so as to cover expressions like ὥς ἀληθῶς, ὥς ἐτητύμως, ὥς ἡπίως, I do not venture to say.

Only one point more. One might object that the ablative of the article ought, like the other oblique cases, to come from the *t*-stem (τo-), not the *s*-stem (ὁ = sa-), so that τῶς (or rather τῶς) would be the normal form, corresponding to τῶν, τῷ, τόν. Now as τῶς (Bekker τῶς) already exists in Epic, a second adverb from the *s*-stem might be thought improbable. But the employment of the same *s*-stem for the ablative adverb is certain in other pronouns. "Ὅδε is a compound of the article and δε; and the adverb of ὅδε is ὤδε, not τῶδε. So οὔτος, which has a compound stem, made up of the article-stem along with another (υτο-), has the adverb οὔτως, not τούτως. Just so the simple ὁ makes ὥς, alongside, it is true, of τῶς. ὦς and τῶς exist side by side, like the nominatives plural οἱ and τοί (both Homeric), and the Sanskrit locatives sa-smīn and ta-smīn.
